

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and remarks. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification as originally filed, and specifically at pages 21-26 and Figure 6.

The claims were objected to for allegedly being unclear. The present Amendment obviates the objection to the claims.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. OBJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §132(a)

The amendment filed March 7, 2006 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) for allegedly introducing new matter into the specification. The present Amendment obviates the new matter objection.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) be withdrawn.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The present Amendment obviates the written description rejection.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,379,133 to Kirk (hereinafter, merely “Kirk”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,037,166 to Malcolm et al. (hereinafter, merely “Malcolm”).

Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,061,083 to Aritake et al. (hereinafter, merely “Aritake”) in view of Malcolm.

As understood by Applicants, Kirk relates to system where a synthetic aperture based sequence of image samples are generated with respect to a subject to be stereoscopically imaged. These sample images are presented to the spaced inputs of a holographic integrated combiner screen to be presented at an output aperture in laterally spaced mutual positioning. The combiner screen may be utilized in conjunction with a holographic optical image combiner

architecture which additionally employs a lens assembly such as a projecting lens to generate multi-zone outputs, each zone of which may be presented for stereoscopic viewing at a discrete viewing station.

As understood by Applicants, Malcolm relates to a hologram which is located at an instrument panel so as to reflect or transmit an image from a source located off the panel.

As understood by Applicants, Aritake relates to a system where images of an object are taken from a plurality of angles so as to generate two-dimensional images obtained from the plurality of angles. The two-dimensional images are sequentially displayed in the form of stripes by a displaying device. The two-dimensional images displayed by the displaying device are deflected by a parallel scanning part by a deflection angle dependent on the individual two-dimensional images and supplied to respective virtual apertures.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... wherein said light-condensing means comprises:

a recursive reflection-type screen means for recursively reflecting each image formed by said image-forming means; and

a half-mirror reflecting means, disposed between said image-forming means and said recursive reflection-type screen means, for condensing said recursively reflected image to said N observing positions ... (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Kirk, Malcolm, and Aritake, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest that the light-condensing means includes a recursive reflection-type screen means for recursively reflecting each image formed by said image-forming means. The applied combinations also fail to teach or suggest that the light-condensing means includes a half-mirror reflecting means, disposed between said image-forming means and said

recursive reflection-type screen means, for condensing said recursively reflected image to said N observing positions, all as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claim 13 is similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and is patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our
Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800